

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 35-56 and 61-66 are canceled without prejudice with this reply. New claims 67-82 have been added. Claims 21-25, 27-34, 59-60, and 67-86 are pending. Claim 27 has been amended to more clearly describe the invention. The Examiner has indicated that claims 21, 22, 24, 25, 28-34, 59 and 60 have allowable subject matter. No new matter has been added.

Rejections withdrawn

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, of claims 21-25, 27-34, 59 and 60. See page 2 of the Office Action.

Claim objections

The Examiner objected to claim 23 for reciting non-elected semiconductor materials. See page 2 of the Office Action. The claim has been amended. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner contents that claim 27 has the same scope as claim 21, the independent claim from which it depends. See page 13 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 21 recites "a linking group which has a distal end and a proximal end... including a first charged or ionizable moiety, wherein... the proximal end includes a hydroxide, an alkoxide, a carboxylate, a sulfonate, a phosphate, a phosphonate, or a quaternary ammonium." Claim 27 recites "the first charged or ionizable moiety includes a hydroxide, alkoxide, carboxylate, sulfonate, phosphate, phosphonate, or quaternary ammonium." In the independent claim, the proximal end includes a first charged or ionizable moiety and, separately, includes a hydroxide, etc. In the dependent claim, the first charged or ionizable moiety includes a hydroxide, etc. Thus, claim 27 is distinguished from the claim from which it depends, and complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant : George P. Anderson et al.  
Serial No. : 09/811,824  
Filed : March 20, 2001  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 14952.0282 / MIT Case 8733

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-13, 15, 16, 35-43, 45-47, 49-50, 61-62, 64 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the '610 patent. See pages 12-13 of the Office Action. In addition, claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11-12, 15, 16, 35-39, 42, 43, 45-46, 49 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the '144 patent. See pages 13-16 of the Office Action. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that "because '610 patent or the '144 patent has different inventive entity... from the instant application... the rejection is proper under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)," these claims have been canceled without prejudice in the interest of advancing prosecution.

**New claims**

New claims 67-82 have been added. Claim 67 depends from claim 21, and claims 68-82 depend from claim 59. No new matter has been added. The new claims are patentable. Applicants ask that the new claims be allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants ask that all claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 19-4293.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-7-04

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Harold H. Fox  
Reg. No. 41,498

Steptoe & Johnson LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-1795  
Phone: 202-429-3000  
Fax: 202-429-3902